



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,333	11/25/2003	Roderick M. Townes	84712 3050 GNN	3929
20736	7590	05/30/2006	EXAMINER	
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER 2000 M STREET NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3307			WIEHE, NATHANIEL EDWARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3745	

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/720,333	TOWNES, RODERICK M.
	Examiner Nathan Wiehe	Art Unit 3745

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05022006.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 24 April 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to Kildea, Applicant argues that the ribs cannot possibly extend into the plenum, or cooling gallery. However, Kildea clearly states, as indicated by applicant, that the ribs decrease the flow area in the plenum. Thus, the ribs must extend into the plenum in order to reduce the flow area. Also, as can be seen in Fig. 6, the ribs include an arched lower surface extending into the plenum.

In regard to Radons, Applicant argues that the "insert 9" directs coolant flow rather than deflecting the air stream. The angled surface of the insert directs coolant by deflecting the airstream radially outward. Further, the insert of Radons is inherently associated with all on the air ducts since the insert directs the cooling air into the ducts.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 02 May 2006 is noted. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

The drawings were received on 24 April 2006. These drawings are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2,3,5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kildea (6,474,946). Kildea discloses a blade cooling arrangement comprising a mounting hub and a blade root (16) forming a cooling gallery (47) there between (See Fig. 6). The blade root (16) includes cooling passages with openings (56). The openings are formed by a plurality of ribs (38) located adjacent to the cooling passage openings and extending into the cooling gallery (47) thus forming flow deflectors (Kildea column 3, lines 10-14). The deflectors have a curved surface defined by the elliptical section of openings (56). Further, the deflectors provide progressive deflection, through the use of smooth surfaces, of coolant towards the openings, which creates a low loss flow limiting the pressure loss upon entry of the coolant into the opening (Kildea column 3, lines 35-42).

Claims 1,2,3,4,6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Radons (GB 2,225,063 A). Radons discloses a blade cooling arrangement including a mounting hub (7), a blade root (11) and a cooling gallery (10) defined between the mounting hub and blade root. Within the cooling gallery (10) a flow deflector (9) is mounted, adjacent to cooling passage opening (21), which extends downwardly from the blade root (11) and upwardly from the mounting hub (7) and is positioned to progressively deflect cooling air toward passages (20,12,21) within the blade root (11). The deflector (9) has a wedge/ramp shape and includes curved surfaces near the cooling air inlet portion (8) as well as the upper portions near edges (15). Further, the

cooling arrangement of Radons provides low loss flow that includes low pressure loss (Radons page 4, lines 1-7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radons in view of Hsing (4,626,169). Radons' deflector further seals the cooling gallery (10) separating the cooled air plenum (19) from the rest of the cooling gallery (10). Radons does not disclose the use of thermal expansion and contraction to adjust the flow deflector. Hsing discloses a flow deflector element (66) directing cooling air to passage (54) through opening (78) and also provides a sealing function within the cooling gallery. The deflector (66) includes elements (70,72,82,80) extending downward from the blade root and come into contact with the mounting hub (20). The deflector is formed of a material having a coefficient of expansion grater than the coefficient of expansion of the mounting hub (20) which provides for improved sealing through thermal expansion and constriction of the elements (70,72,82,80) and the mounting hub (20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the deflector of Radons by constructing the deflector from a material that would result in differential expansion and contraction

relative to the mounting hub as taught by Hsing in order to increase the sealing capabilities of the deflector (Hsing column 6, 37-53).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Wiehe whose telephone number is (571)272-8648. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. and alternate Fri., 7am-4:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Look can be reached on (571)272-4820. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Nathan Wiehe
Examiner
Art Unit 3745



EDWARD K. LOOK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

5/25/06